



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,007	01/20/2004	Kazuma Aoki	118331	6840
25944 7590 07/23/2010 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
YIP, KENT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/23/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com  
jarnstrong@oliff.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/759,007

**Applicant(s)**

AOKI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Kent Yip

**Art Unit**

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-18, 20 and 23-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-18, 20, 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, 16-18, and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6-8, 14-18, 20, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. US 7289685 (hereinafter Wolff) in view of Ackaret US 2003/0088828.

**Regarding claim 1**, Wolff teaches:

A communication system, comprising:

a printing unit that is controlled to print an image on a recording medium (col 3 line 42 printer);

a scanning unit that is controlled to scan an image (col 3 line 42 scanner);

an accessing system that connects with a web page (Fig. 12 ISNdata.com) though a network in response to an operation of a user (col 3 line 2 general purpose computer, col 3 lines 43-44 network connection, col 8 lines 25-30 Fig. 11-12, col 10 lines 30-38; web browser);

a first print controller that controls said printing unit (col 3 lines 39-45) to print the web page accessed by said accessing system on a first recording medium (col 10 lines 30-35; It is well known to be able to print a web page accessed via a web browser.);

a second print controller that operates such that (col 3 lines 39-45),

a scan controller that controls said scanning unit to scan the second recording medium having been filled in by the user to capture an image thereof (col 4 lines 30-60 Fig. 1 [103-104]);

a recognition system that recognizes contents written in the fill-in area (col 4 lines 45-67) and the destination area based on the image of the second recording medium scanned by said scanning unit under control of said scan controller (col 5 lines 66-67 to col 6 lines 1-2); and

a data transmitting system that transmits contents written in the fill-in area and recognized by said recognition system to the destination printed in the destination area and recognized by said recognition system (col 5 lines 63-67 to col 6 line 1).

Wolff does not explicitly teach:

a determination unit that determines whether the web page accessed using said accessing system includes an input field in which data is to be input by the user and the data input in the input field is to be transmitted to a predetermined destination;

when the determination unit determines that the web page accessed using said accessing system includes the input field in which the data is to be input by the user and the data input in the input field being to be transmitted to the predetermined destination, said second print controller controls said printing unit to automatically print an image

having at least a fill-in area corresponding to the input field, the fill-in area being to be filled in by the user, and a destination area indicating the destination defined by the web page on a second recording medium;

Ackaret teaches:

a determination unit that determines whether the web page accessed using said accessing system includes an input field in which data is to be input by the user and the data input in the input field is to be transmitted to a predetermined destination (p0002 lines 1-8; A web browser determine whether a web page it accesses includes input fields when interpreting the html commands described the web page.);

when the determination unit determines that the web page accessed using said accessing system includes the input field in which the data is to be input by the user and the data input in the input field being to be transmitted to the predetermined destination, said second print controller controls said printing unit to automatically print an image having at least a fill-in area corresponding to the input field, the fill-in area being to be filled in by the user, and a destination area indicating the destination defined by the web page on a second recording medium (p0002 lines 1-8; When printing a web form, a web browser will automatically render the form according to the html commands of the web page.);

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Ackaret into Wolff since Wolff teaches using a web browser to access a form (col 10 lines 30-38) and Ackaret also

teaches using a web browser to access a form (pg 72-76) where a web browser provides a convenient means to display and print a web form.

**Regarding claim 6, Wolff in view of Ackaret teach:**

The communication system according to claim 1, wherein, when the web page accessed with said accessing system includes a plurality of groups of input fields, the input fields falling within a same group having a same destination, the input fields falling within different groups having different destinations (Wolff col 5 lines 66-67 to col 6 lines 1-5 user can override certain destinations identified by forms), said second print controller controls said printing unit to print an image having at least the fill-in area and the destination area on different second recording mediums for different groups of input fields (Wolff col 4 lines 5-6 the form can span multiple pages with multiple groups of input fields).

**Regarding claim 7, Wolff in view of Ackaret teach:**

The communication system according to claim 1, wherein, when the web page accessed with said accessing system includes a plurality of groups of input fields, the input fields falling within a same group having a same destination, the input fields falling within different groups having different destinations (Wolff col 5 lines 66-67 to col 6 lines 1-5 user can override certain destinations identified by forms), said second print controller controls said printing unit to print an image having at least the fill-in area and the destination area on the same second recording medium regardless whether the plurality of input fields fall within the different groups (Wolff col 4 lines 5-6 the form can span a single page with multiple groups of input fields).

**Claims 8 and 16** recite identical features as claim 1 respectively, thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 8-9 and 16.

**Claims 14-15** recite identical features as claims 6-7 respectively, thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claims 6-7 are equally applicable to claims 14-15.

**Claims 17-18** recite identical features as claim 1 respectively, except the limitations are embodied in a computer program product (Wolff col 3 lines 1-31), thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 17-19.

**Claim 20** recite identical features as claim 1 respectively, except claim 20 is a method claim. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 20.

**Regarding claim 23**, Wolff in view of Ackaret teach:

The communication system according to claim 1, wherein the second print controller generates a print form or an image data of an input sheet to be printed based on the web page (Wolff col 10 lines 30-38 Fig. 2) which is determined, by the determination unit, to include the input field (Ackaret p0002 lines 1-8).

**Claims 24-27** recite similar features as claim 23 respectively, thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 23 are equally applicable to claims 24-27.

3. Claims 2-5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. US 7289685 (hereinafter Wolff) in view of Ackaret US 2003/0088828 and Silverbrook et al. US 2003/0093378 (hereinafter Silverbrook).

**Regarding claim 2**, Wolff in view of Ackaret teach:

The communication system according to claim 1,

wherein said second print controller is configured to examine whether the web page accessed with said accessing system includes term data representing an effective term of the web page (Wolff col 7 lines 15-33 validation requirements), said second print controller controls said printing unit to print an image having a term area related to the term data as well as the fill-in area and the destination area on the second recording medium (Wolff Fig. 2 due date),

wherein said recognition system is configured to recognize contents printed in the fill-in area, the destination area (Wolff col 7 lines 18-22) and the term area of the image scanned by said scanning unit (Wolff col 7 lines 30-33 a valid date),

wherein said communication system further comprises a term examining system that determines whether a current date/time is later than a term that is printed in the term area of the second recording medium and recognized by said recognition system (Wolff col 7 lines 15-33 Fig. 2 shows a Due Date and a Date next to the signature. It would be inherent for the server 1103 to compare the dates to meet validation requirements.), and

Wolff does not explicitly teach:



wherein said data transmitting system is configured to transmits the contents written in the fill-in area to the destination indicated by the contents in the destination area only when said term examining system determines that the current date/time is on or before the term extracted from the term area of the second recording medium.

Silverbrook teaches:

wherein said data transmitting system is configured to transmits the contents written in the fill-in area to the destination indicated by the contents in the destination area only when said term examining system determines that the current date/time is on or before the term extracted from the term area of the second recording medium (p0253).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Silverbrook into Wolff since Wolff teaches using forms to collect information (col 4 lines 30-33) and Silverbrook also teaches using forms to collect information (p0251) where the forms are kept up to date via a version history (p0254).

**Regarding claim 3**, Wolff in view of Ackaret and Silverbrook teach:

The communication system according to claim 2, further comprising a notifying system that notifies a user of said communication system that the current date/time is later than the effective term of the web page when said term examining system determines that the current date/time is later than the term extracted from the term area of the second recording medium (Silverbrook p0253 lines 14-16).

**Regarding claim 4**, Wolff in view of Ackaret teach:

The communication system according to claim 1,  
wherein said recognition system is configured to recognize contents printed in the fill-in area, the destination area (Wolff col 7 lines 18-22), the last-modified time area and the access data area of the image scanned by said scanning unit (Wolff col 7 lines 30-33 a valid date),

wherein said communication system further comprises:

a modified date/time examining system that examines whether the last-modified date/time obtained by said modified date/time obtaining system coincides with a date/time that is printed in the last-modified date/time area and recognized by said recognition system (Wolff col 7 lines 30-33 a valid date),

wherein said data transmitting system is configured to transmits the contents written in the fill-in area to the destination indicated by the contents in the destination area only when said modified date/time examining system determines that the last modified date/time obtained by said modified date/time obtaining system coincides with a date/time printed in the last-modified date/time area and recognized by said recognition system (Wolff col 7 lines 15-33 Fig. 2 shows a Due Date and a Date next to the signature. It would be inherent for the server 1103 to compare the dates to meet validation requirements.).

Wolff does not explicitly teach:

wherein said second print controller is configured to examine whether the web page accessed with said accessing system includes a modified time data representative of a date/time when the contents of the web page were lastly modified, said second

print controller controls said printing unit to print an image having a last-modified time area representing the last modified date/time of the web page and an access data area having access data that was referred to when said accessing system accessed the web page as well as the fill-in area and the destination area on the second recording medium,

a modified date/time obtaining system that obtains the last-modified date/time from the web page with reference to the data in the access data area; and

Silverbrook teaches:

wherein said second print controller is configured to examine whether the web page accessed with said accessing system includes a modified time data representative of a date/time when the contents of the web page were lastly modified (p0254 version history), said second print controller controls said printing unit to print an image having a last-modified time area representing the last modified date/time of the web page and an access data area having access data that was referred to when said accessing system accessed the web page as well as the fill-in area and the destination area on the second recording medium (p0253 lines 1-3),

a modified date/time obtaining system that obtains the last-modified date/time from the web page with reference to the data in the access data area (p0254 version history); and

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Silverbrook into Wolff since Wolff teaches using forms to collect information (col 4 lines 30-33) and Silverbrook also

teaches using forms to collect information (p0251) where the forms are kept up to date via a version history (p0254).

**Regarding claim 5**, Wolff in view of Ackaret and Silverbrook teach:

The communication system according to claim 4, further comprising a notifying system that notifies a user of said communication system (Silverbrook p0253 lines 14-16) that the last-modified date/time obtained by said modified date/time obtaining system does not coincide with a date/time that is extracted from the last-modified date/time area of the second recording medium when said modified date/time examining system determines that the last-modified date/time obtained by said modified date/time obtaining system does not coincide with a date/time printed in the last-modified date/time area of the second recording medium and recognized by said recognition system (Wolff col 7 lines 30-33 a non-valid date according to validation requirements).

**Claims 10-13** recite identical features as claims 2-5 respectively, thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claims 2-5 are equally applicable to claims 10-13.

***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Yip whose telephone number is (571) 270-5244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 10:00 AM - 6:00 PM EDT.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. Y./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625